

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/967,272	09/28/2001	Carlton Bartels	CF-55	6788
64558 7590 08/27/2007 FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP		7	EXAMINER	
ROPES & GRAY LLP			KESACK, DANIEL	
1211 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 10036-8704			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3691	•
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/967,272	.BARTELS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	•
Dan Kesack	3691	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 07 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. 🛛 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). **NOTICE OF APPEAL** 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on ... A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal: and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: \_ Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. Other: \_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. Regarding the rejection of claims 1 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 101, Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection. Regarding claim 1, Examiner is of the opinion that, given its broadest reasonable interpretation, claim 1 recites an abstract idea, and is not directed to a practical application of the abstract idea. Claim 1 is considered abstract because it does not produce a tangible result. Changing a cost or a volume of credits is not a tangible result because it is not clear how or where the cost or volume is being changed. The changing does not necessarily take place as a "real world" event, and could be a thought or an idea. For at least these reasons, the claim remains rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Regarding claim 21, in response to Applicant's arguments, it is noted that claim 21 is not a product-by-process claim. The recitation of "a computing device to perform the method of claim 1" does not satisfy the requirements of 101. "An apparatus comprising a computing device" does not have structure, and could be reasonably interpreted as being software per se. If is also noted that the claim is directed only to the so-called "computing device" and the recitation that the device is "to perform the method of claim 1" is also regarded as non-functional descriptive language, and neither limits nor gives structure to the computing device.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Examiner failed to establish that the cited references teach all the claim limitations of claim 1, Examiner respectfully disagrees. The cited "cost of pollution credits", as taught by the prior art, at least reads on the limitation of "changing a cost to generate reductions of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions in order to generate credits of carbon dioxide equivalent emission reductions." The claim limitation recites a changing a cost to generate reductions, which in turn generates credits, and therefore the teachings of the prior art are applicable.

At least because of the reasons above, independent claims 1 and 21 are rejected, and therefore the claims which depend from claims 1 and 21 are likewise rejected.

ALEXANDER KALINOWSKI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER